



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,797	12/31/2001	Paul W. White	BS01-101	5726
45695	7590	02/13/2006		
WITHERS & KEYS FOR BELL SOUTH				
P. O. BOX 71355				
MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355				
			EXAMINER	
			KRISCIUNAS, LINDA MARY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/029,797

Applicant(s)

WHITE ET AL.

Examiner

Linda Krisciunas

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 8-9, 14-19, and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chaar et al (US 5,960,404).

As per claims 1, 8, 14-15, 24-25, and 28-29 Chaar teaches providing a first group with access to a web application, to place a first command into the web application (See Figure 1, where the source agent (110) submits a task request (140) which is equivalent to placing a command into the application and column 3, lines 63-65: "A workflow abstraction called Source that represents a workflow or service requestor that generates a sequence of service requests as part of a process execution."); providing a second group with access to the web application, to receive the first command from the first group (See Figure 1, where the performer agent (130) receives the task request (140) and column 4, lines 17-19: "A continuously available Network that allows Source Agents and Performer Agents to communicate with each other."); providing the second group with access to the web application, to respond that the first command has been completed into the web application (See Figure 1, where the performer agent (130) sends a task response (150) and column 3, lines 65-67: "A workflow abstraction called Performer that represents a service provider (human, application, or workflow server) that provides services in response to service requests generated by Sources.");

providing the first group with access to the web application, to place a second command into the web application (See Figure 1, where the source agent (110) submits a task request (140) which is equivalent to placing a command into the application); providing a third group with access to the web application, to receive the second command from the first group (See Figure 1, where the performer agent (130) receives the task request (140)); providing the third group with access to the web application, to respond that the second command has been completed into the web application (See Figure 1, where the performer agent (130) sends a task response (150)); providing the first group with access to the web application, to place a third command into the web application (See Figure 1, where the source agent (110) submits a task request (140) which is equivalent to placing a command into the application and the process is iterative, so many commands are placed); providing the second group with access to the web application, to receive the third command from the first group (See Figure 1, where the performer agent (130) receives the task request (140)); providing the second group with access to the web application, to respond that the third command has been completed into the web application (See Figure 1, where the performer agent (130) sends a task response (150)).

As per claim 2, 9, 17-19, 26-27 and 30 Chaar teaches the web application may be accessed through a global internet and a local internet (column 3, lines 16-19: "local-area networks (LANs), wide-area networks (WANs), and global networks and provides a homogeneous view of heterogeneous workflow systems and components.").

As per claim 3, Chaar teaches the first group manages the second and third group (See Figure 16: "FIG. 16 shows how group and role managers can be implemented in a distributed workflow system using Performer Agents and Source Agents.").

As per claim 16, Chaar teaches internal groups that input a first information into internal input fields (See Figure 1, where the source agent (110) submits a task request (140) which is equivalent to placing a command into the application); external groups that input second information into external input fields (See Figure 1, where the performer agent (130) sends a task response (150)); a first access limiter adapter to limit access of the internal groups to prevent internal groups from inputting the first information into the external field inputs and a second access limiter adapted to limit access of the external groups to prevent external groups from inputting the second information into the internal input fields (column 8, lines 16-20: "It is important to note that both Control Request 271 and Query Request 281 contain the Task ID of the Task that needs to be controlled or queried, which is obtained as a part of the Task Request Acknowledgment 145 in FIG. 2A." and column 1, lines 38-56: "The WfMC Reference Model also defines interfaces between these components. Interface 1 (builder-server interface) defines a common process definition format for the interchange of static process specifications between a Process Definition Tool and a Workflow Server [WFMC-WG01-1000]. Interface 2 (client-server interface) defines an API that provides a complete range of interactions between a Workflow Client and a Workflow Server [WFMC-TC-1009]. These include worklist interaction, query and control of workflow

processes and their activities, and administrative functions. Interface 3 (application invocation interface) is not currently available, but is intended to describe how applications are invoked. Interface 4 (server-server interface) defines an API that describes the interactions between two Workflow Servers [WfMC-TC-1012]. Interactions include initiation, query and control of workflow processes and their activities, and administrative functions. Finally, Interface 5 (monitor-server interface) defines audit data for administrating and monitoring a Workflow Server [WfMC-TC-1015]" which explains that the tasks are controlled. Therefore ensuring that internal groups do not use the external field and vice versa would be controlled by the WfMC model and the Control Request (271).).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaar in view of Olapurath et al (US 6,678,714).

As per claim 4, Chaar does not explicitly teach task order. Olapurath teaches that it is know that the steps must occur in chronological order (column 3, lines 48-50: "In other words a task definer 1030 can define the order in which tasks in a task group are to be executed."). Olapurath is an analogous art as it also teaches about computer implemented task management systems. Therefore it would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 3623

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the task management system of Chaar with the task-ordering feature of Olapurath to provide an efficient means for organizing the stored information.

As per claims 21-23, Chaar does not explicitly teach a report generator. Olapurath teaches that it is known that the system includes a report generator designed to generate reports based on: the first information inputted by any or all of the plurality of internal groups; the second information inputted by any or all of the plurality of external groups; and a calendar date at which the plurality of information was inputted (See Figure 3 which contains a GUI of the task server and the specific tasks associated with that project. See also column 5, lines 1-3: "As shown on Fulfiller interface 40, the task status 48 is displayed as well as the date and time 50 that the most recent status was reported." Whereby the date is also noted.). Olapurath is an analogous art as it also teaches about computer implemented task management systems. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the task management system of Chaar with the report generator feature of Olapurath to provide an efficient means for reviewing the stored information.

5. Claims 5-7, 10-13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaar.

As per claims 5-7 and 11-13, Chaar does not explicitly teach a pit contractor or technician. Chaar does teach (column 4, line 36: "performers may be human participants". Official notice is taken that since Chaar teaches human participants it

Art Unit: 3623

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Chaar with various human subjects, such as a pit contractor or technician to provide a means for efficiently managing a schedule/project.)

As per claims 10 and 20, Chaar does not explicitly teach a firewall. (Official notice is taken that the use of firewalls with web applications is old and well known. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a firewall on the internet application to provide a more secure and marketable product.).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following art also teaches about workflow operations: Jilk et al (US 6,859,523), Jilk et al (US 6,938,048), Downs et al (US 6,249,836), and LeVander (US 6,216,108).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Linda Krisciunas whose telephone number is 571-272-6931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 6:30 am to 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LMK

LMK
February 3, 2006

(C. Michelle Tarac)
C. Michelle Tarac
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3623